BEST COPY
AVAILABLE

MONTANA LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Chapter 372 19 85

Bill H 496 S _____ Original bill & history ✓ C

H. Committee on Local Government		S. Committee on Local Government	
Hearing Date(s) Feb 14	✓ C	Hearing Date(s) Mar 26	✓ C
_____	____ C	_____	____ C
_____	____ C	_____	____ C
_____	____ C	_____	____ C
Date Out Feb 14	✓ C	Mar 26	✓ C

Did this bill originate in an interim committee? ____ Yes ____ No

Committee _____ Report _____

HOUSE BILL NO. 496

INTRODUCED BY DARKO, MOHAR, RANEY,
PETERSON, BACHINI, HANSEN

IN THE HOUSE

January 26, 1985	Introduced and referred to Committee on Local Government.
February 15, 1985	Committee recommend bill do pass as amended. Report adopted.
February 16, 1985	Bill printed and placed on members' desks.
February 18, 1985	Second reading, do pass as amended.
February 19, 1985	Correctly engrossed.
February 20, 1985	Third reading, passed.
	Transmitted to Senate.

IN THE SENATE

February 22, 1985	Introduced and referred to Committee on Local Government.
March 26, 1985	Committee recommend bill be concurred in. Report adopted.
March 29, 1985	Second reading, concurred in.
March 30, 1985	Third reading, concurred in. Ayes, 49; Noes, 0.
	Returned to House.

IN THE HOUSE

March 30, 1985	Received from Senate.
	Sent to enrolling.
	Reported correctly enrolled.

HOUSE BILL NO. 496

INTRODUCED BY Marko Mohan Raney Peterson Bachaus, Stella Jean Hansen

A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE CREATION OF COUNTY PARK DISTRICTS FOR THE OPERATION OF COUNTY OR DONATED PARK AND RECREATION LANDS WITHIN THE DISTRICTS; PROVIDING FOR THE CREATION, AFTER AN ELECTION, OF SUCH A DISTRICT; PROVIDING FOR AN ELECTED COMMISSION TO ADMINISTER THE DISTRICT; PROVIDING FOR A PROPERTY TAX MILL LEVY FOR THE OPERATION OF THE DISTRICT; PROVIDING THAT THE MAXIMUM DISTRICT MILL LEVY MUST BE APPROVED BY THE DISTRICT ELECTORATE; PROVIDING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF SUCH A DISTRICT; PROVIDING BONDING AUTHORITY FOR SUCH A DISTRICT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE ALTERATION AND DISSOLUTION OF SUCH A DISTRICT."

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA:

Section 1. Park and recreation land -- definition. As used in [this act], "park and recreation land" means real property, buildings, and fixtures on:

(1) land designated as park land or recreational land by the grant or deed of such land to the county;

(2) land owned, leased, or otherwise possessed by a county and which the governing body of a county has designated as park or recreational land;

(3) land belonging to a public or private entity or person who has donated the recreational rights to such land to a county park district on behalf of the county; or

(4) land which, by agreement between an owner of land and a county park district, the district may use for park or recreational purposes.

Section 2. Duties of county park district. A county park district shall operate and maintain park and recreation land within the district and may conduct such programs relating to parks and recreation and make such improvements to such land as the county park district commissioners consider appropriate.

Section 3. Territory of county park district. A county park district may contain the entire territory of a county or any part of a county. A county park district may include incorporated municipalities within the county.

Section 4. Creation of county park district. (1) Proceedings for the creation of a county park district may be initiated by:

(a) a petition signed by not less than 15% of the qualified electors of the proposed park district; or

(b) a resolution of intent adopted by the county governing body, calling for the creation of a county park district.

(2) The petition or resolution must contain:

INTRODUCED BILL
HB 496

(a) the boundaries of the proposed district;

(b) the proposed maximum property tax mill levy that could be levied on property owners within the district for the operation of the district; and

(c) the proposed number of members of the county park district commission. The number of members must be an odd number and may not be less than three.

(3) Upon receipt of a petition for the creation of a county park district, the county clerk shall examine it and within 15 days either reject the petition if it is insufficient under the provisions of subsections (1) and (2) or certify that the petition is sufficient and present it to the county governing body at its next meeting.

(4) The county governing body shall schedule a public hearing on the creation of a county park district no earlier than 21 days or later than 45 days after the presentation of the petition or adoption of the resolution of intent to create a district. It shall cause to be published in the official county newspaper notice of the public hearing and the proposed boundary, mill levy, and number of members of the district commission.

(5) At the hearing, the county governing body shall hear testimony of all interested persons on whether a county park district should be created; testimony regarding the proposed boundary, property tax mill levy, and number of

members of the district commission; and any other matter relating to the proposed district.

(6) After the hearing, if the county governing body determines that the proposed park district should be created, it shall by resolution set the boundaries of the proposed park district, the maximum mill levy for the proposed park district, and the number of members to be on the district commission. The resolution must also call for an election, which may be held in conjunction with any regularly scheduled election, on the question of whether to create the county park district.

Section 5. Election on creation of district. (1) The election on the question of whether to create a county park district must be conducted as provided in Title 13.

(2) Only qualified electors residing within the proposed park district may vote on the question of whether to create the district.

(3) The question of creating a county park district shall be submitted to the electors in substantially the following form:

☐ FOR the creation of a county park district which may levy not more than ___ mills of property tax for the operation of the district.

☐ AGAINST the creation of a county park district.

Section 6. Formation of county park district --

appointment of initial commission. (1) If the question of forming a county park district is approved by the electorate of the district, the county governing body shall, within 10 days of receipt of the official canvass of such result, certify that the district is formed.

(2) Within 30 days after the certification of the formation of the district, the county governing body shall appoint the initial members of the county park district commission. The members shall serve until their successors are elected and qualified.

Section 7. Election of commissioners. (1) After appointment of the initial commission and except in the case of vacancies, all members of the county park district commission must be elected by the electors of the district.

(2) The election of members to the commission must be held in conjunction with the school elections held pursuant to 20-3-304.

(3) Candidates for the office of member of the county park district commission must be nominated by petition filed with the office of the election administrator at least 30 days prior to the election day and signed by at least five electors of the district.

(4) If no nomination petition is filed for an office, the county governing body shall appoint a member to fill the term. A person appointed pursuant to this subsection has the

same term and obligations as a person elected to fill the office. If there are no petitions of nomination for members of the commission, no election need be held.

(5) The term of office of elected members commences upon their being elected and qualified. The term of office of an elected member of the county park district commission is 4 years, except that a simple majority of the members of the first elected board shall serve terms of 2 years, with a minority of the board serving terms of 4 years. The members serving 2-year terms must be selected by lot.

(6) A vacancy in the office of a member must be filled by appointment by the remaining members of the commission. The term of the appointed member expires upon the election and qualification of an elected successor or upon the election of a member to fill the unexpired term of the vacant office. The election must be held at the next scheduled school election.

Section 8. Compensation of members of county park district commission. Members of a county park district commission serve without compensation.

Section 9. Powers of county park district commission. A county park district commission has all powers necessary for the betterment, operation, maintenance, and administration of park and recreation land within the territory of the district. In the exercise of this general

grant of powers, the county park district commission may:

(1) employ or contract with administrative, professional, and other personnel necessary for the operation of the district;

(2) lease, purchase, or contract for the purchase of personal property, including property which after purchase constitutes a fixture on real property;

(3) lease, purchase, or contract for the purchase of buildings and facilities on lands controlled by the district and equip, operate, and maintain such buildings and facilities;

(4) adopt by resolution rules for the operation and administration of all parks and recreational facilities under its control;

(5) impose by resolution and collect charges for such services and facilities provided by the district as the commission considers necessary for the prudent operation of the district;

(6) establish a property tax mill levy for the operation of the district as provided in [section 9];

(7) enter into agreements with any public or private entity or person for the operation of parks or recreational areas either by the district on behalf of the landowner or by another entity on behalf of the district;

(8) with the concurrence of the county governing body,

accept donations of land or recreational-type easements on land within the district for park or recreational purposes on behalf and in the name of the county;

(9) accept donations and devises of money or personal property.

Section 10. District budget -- property tax levy. (1) The county park district commission shall annually prepare a budget for the ensuing fiscal year and present the budget to the county governing body at the regular budget meetings as prescribed in Title 7, chapter 6, part 23, and certify the amount of money necessary for the operation of the district for the ensuing fiscal year.

(2) The county governing body must, annually at the time of levying county taxes, fix and levy a tax in mills on all taxable property within the district sufficient to raise the amount certified by the county park district commission. The tax so levied may not in any year exceed the maximum amount approved by the electorate in [section 4 or section 10].

Section 11. Election to change maximum property tax mill levy. (1) The maximum property tax mill levy authorized for the operation of a county park district may be changed by an election on the question of changing the maximum mill levy.

(2) A vote on the question of raising or lowering the

maximum property tax mill levy in the district may be initiated by:

(a) a petition signed by not less than 15% of the electorate of the district; or

(b) a resolution of the county park district commission.

(3) The petition or resolution must set forth the proposed new maximum mill levy for the operation of the district.

(4) Upon receipt of a petition for a change in the maximum mill levy, certified by the county clerk as sufficient under this section, or a resolution for such a change adopted by the county park district commission, the county governing body shall submit to the electorate of the district, at the next election at which members are elected to the county park district commission, a ballot question on changing the maximum mill levy. The election on the question of changing the maximum mill levy must be held as provided in Title 13. The question must be submitted to the electors of the district in substantially the following form:

☐ FOR changing the authorized maximum property tax mill levy for the operation of the county park district from ___ to ____.

☐ AGAINST changing the authorized maximum property tax

mill levy for the operation of the county park district.

(5) The new maximum property tax mill levy is authorized for the following tax year if approved by a simple majority of the votes on the question.

Section 12. Park district bonds authorized. (1) A county park district may borrow money by the issuance of its bonds to provide funds for payment of all or part of the cost of construction, acquisition, furnishing, equipping, extension, and betterment of park facilities and to provide an adequate working capital for such facilities.

(2) The amount of bonds issued for such purchase and outstanding at any time may not exceed 20% of the taxable value of the property within the district as ascertained by the last assessment for state and county taxes previous to the issuance of such bonds.

(3) Such bonds must be authorized, sold, and issued and provisions made for their payment in the manner and subject to the conditions and limitations prescribed for bonds of school districts by Title 20, chapter 9, part 4.

Section 13. Alteration of district boundaries. (1) The boundaries of a county park district may be enlarged by the annexation of contiguous territory in the county or it may be reduced in size by the withdrawal of territory from the district after an election on the question approved by

simple majorities of the electorate involved.

(2) The alteration of the district boundary may be initiated in the same manner as the creation of the district, except the applicable resolutions, hearings, and procedures must be adopted and conducted by the county park district commission and not by the county governing body. If the alteration is proposed by petition, the petition must be signed by 15% of the electorate in the territory to be annexed or withdrawn from the district and certified as sufficient by the county clerk.

(3) (a) In the case of annexation, the vote on the question requires the separate majorities of the electorate of the territory to be annexed and the electorate of the then constituted district.

(b) In the case of withdrawal of territory, only the electorate of the territory to be withdrawn may vote on the question.

(4) A change in the boundaries of a district is effective on January 1 of the year following the election authorizing the change in boundaries.

Section 14. Dissolution of county park district. (1) A county park district may be dissolved after an election on the question of dissolving the district. The process of dissolving the district may be initiated by a petition of 25% of the electorate of the district or by a resolution of

intent to dissolve the district adopted by either the county park district commission or the county governing body.

(2) Upon receipt of such a petition which has been certified by the county clerk as sufficient under this section or upon the adoption of such a resolution of intent, the county governing body shall call a public hearing on the question of dissolving the district and cause to be published a notice of the hearing in the official county newspaper.

(3) At the public hearing the county governing body shall hear testimony of interested persons regarding the dissolution of the district. After the public hearing the county governing body may either submit the question of dissolving the district to the electorate of the district or it may call for a public hearing on the question of altering the boundaries of the district. If the county governing body calls for a public hearing on the question of altering the boundaries of the district by withdrawal of territory, it shall cause to be published notice of such a hearing in the official county newspaper. The notice must state the boundaries of the area proposed to be withdrawn from the district. After hearing testimony at such hearing, the county governing body may submit the question of either dissolving the district or altering the district by withdrawal of specified territory from the district to the

electorate of the district.

(4) Such a question must be submitted by a resolution calling for an election on either dissolving the district or altering the boundaries of the district by withdrawal of land from the district. The county governing body may call a special election for such purposes, or it may schedule the election in conjunction with any other regularly scheduled election. The election on the question must be conducted as provided in Title 13.

(5) The question of withdrawal of territory under this section must be voted on separately by the electorate of the territory to be withdrawn and the electorate of the balance of the territory of the district. The question fails unless a simple majority of those voting on the question in each of the two territories authorize altering the district boundary. If the question passes, the boundary alteration is effective the following January 1. If the question fails, the county governing body shall by resolution call for an election on the question of dissolving the district.

Section 15. Effect of dissolution. (1) If dissolution of a county park district is authorized by a majority of the electorate of the district, the county governing body shall order the dissolution and file the order with the county clerk. The dissolution is effective upon the earlier of the following:

(a) 6 months after the date of filing of the order; or

(b) certification by the members of the county park commission that all debts and obligations of the district have been paid, discharged, or irrevocably settled.

(2) If debts or obligations of the district remain unsatisfied after the dissolution of the district, the county governing body shall, for as long as necessary, levy a property tax, in an amount not to exceed the voted maximum authorized by the district, on all taxable property that is in the territory formerly comprising the district, to be used to discharge the debts of the former district. If the electors of the district lowered the maximum amount to be levied for the operation of the district within 2 calendar years prior to the election authorizing the dissolution, the county governing body is authorized to levy a property tax not to exceed the maximum levy authorized prior to the reduction of the maximum levy for the discharge of the district's obligations.

(3) Any assets of the district remaining after all debts and obligations have been discharged become the property of the county.

-End-

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT; REDUCE SEVERANCE TAX TRUST ; USE FOR CAPITAL NEEDS

1/26	INTRODUCED	
1/28	FISCAL NOTE REQUESTED	
1/28	REFERRED TO NATURAL RESOURCES	
2/02	FISCAL NOTE RECEIVED	
2/13	HEARING	
2/25	COMMITTEE REPORT-BILL PASS AS AMENDED	
2/26	2ND READING PASS AS AMENDED	54 45
2/27	3RD READING PASS	55 45
	TRANSMITTED TO SENATE	
3/06	REFERRED TO TAXATION	
3/22	HEARING	
4/05	TABLED IN COMMITTEE	

HB 495 INTRODUCED BY RAMIREZ, PAVLOVICH, ET AL.
INFRASTRUCTURE BOND ACT OF 1985

1/26	INTRODUCED	
1/28	REFERRED TO NATURAL RESOURCES	
2/13	HEARING	
2/25	COMMITTEE REPORT-BILL PASS AS AMENDED	
2/26	2ND READING PASS	56 44
2/27	3RD READING PASS	57 43
	TRANSMITTED TO SENATE	
3/06	REFERRED TO TAXATION	
3/22	HEARING	
4/05	TABLED IN COMMITTEE	

HB 496 INTRODUCED BY DARKO, MOHAR, ET AL.
AUTHORIZING FORMATION OF COUNTY PARK DISTRICTS

1/26	INTRODUCED	
1/26	REFERRED TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT	
2/14	HEARING	
2/15	COMMITTEE REPORT-BILL PASS AS AMENDED	
2/18	2ND READING PASS AS AMENDED	69 29
2/20	3RD READING PASS	72 28
	TRANSMITTED TO SENATE	
2/22	REFERRED TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT	
3/26	HEARING	
3/26	COMMITTEE REPORT-BILL CONCURRED	
3/29	2ND READING CONCURRED	48 1
3/30	3RD READING CONCURRED	49 0
	RETURNED TO HOUSE	
4/04	SIGNED BY SPEAKER	
4/04	SIGNED BY PRESIDENT	
4/04	TRANSMITTED TO GOVERNOR	
4/08	SIGNED BY GOVERNOR	
	CHAPTER NUMBER 377 EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/01/85	

HB 497 INTRODUCED BY KOEHNKE, MCCORMICK, ET AL.
PROVIDE DISCRETION TO APPROVAL AGENTS FOR HIGH SCHOOL TUITION APPLICATIONS

DISCUSSION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 818: Rep. Wallin stated to Rep. Patterson that as he reads the bill, he has the same concerns. It doesn't limit in any way for the county to use the money any way it wants. Rep. Patterson said this was written so that private museums who charge could use the money. The county commissioners wouldn't do that. Rep. Wallin then asked if Rep. Patterson would have any objections if that was worked into the bill as an amendment, to which Rep. Patterson answered that would be okay.

Rep. Patterson then closed his presentation of HB 818.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 496: Rep. Paula Darko of District 2, Libby, appeared as sponsor of this bill. Vice Chairman Wallin took over the chair while Rep. Darko presented her bill. She said this is a piece of legislation that originated as an idea from the people of her community. One of the problems they have is that they have recreational lands within the community, and this bill is a vehicle for the community to be able to create a Recreation District. They also need a swimming pool and have tried many ways to get the money to build the pool. The tax base does not go for it. This bill is a vehicle that they have come to the Legislature with so that they can go ahead with plans to build the pool. It is very narrowly drawn, and she had it purposely drawn that way.

PROPONENTS: Daniel Miller, Personnel Manager at Champion International, Libby, appeared in behalf of the Libby Swimming Pool Task Force. Their efforts have been endorsed by both the Libby City Council and the Lincoln County Commissioners. He presented written testimony in support of HB 496, which is attached as exhibit 1.

Mitzi Smart of Libby stated she is a nurse and a mother, and is appearing here in support of HB 496. She also presented written testimony which is attached as exhibit 2.

Stephen Pray, representing the Lincoln County Parks and Recreation Department, stated they support this bill. He read written testimony, which is also attached, as exhibit 3.

Bayard Stone of Libby stated that Lincoln County Park and Recreation Department of the Libby area is not without water, but they do not have any way of training their children in the proper way to using that water, like for swimming. As a parent, he feels there is a need in the community for a swimming pool, and for this reason he would like for this bill to pass.

Dsve Conklin, representing the Lewis and Clark Park Board, stated he would like to testify in support of this bill.

A week ago he testified on SB 204. That bill was an idea of the Parks Department, and he doesn't see any conflicts between the contents of these two bills. Federal revenue sources such as revenue sharing in counties will need as much help as possible to fund these kinds of programs.

Joan Poston, representing the Lewis and Clark County Park Board, presented written testimony in favor of HB 496, which is attached as exhibit 4.

Harley Paulson, Community Education Director, from Libby, sent a letter to Rep.Darko requesting her support of this bill which would form a county park district and this would provide recreational services for youth and adults. His letter is attached as exhibit 5.

Lenore Goyen, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Libby School District No. 4, also sent Rep. Darko a letter which stated their position is not one of non-support of the bill, but rather as one of not wishing to own and operate a pool due to funding complications. However, they wanted to go on record as being interested should the pool be built, of being willing to provide swimming programs that would be of benefit for their students. This letter is attached as exhibit 6.

OPPONENTS: There were no opponents present.

In closing, Rep. Darko stated that the thing this stresses is that it is enabling type of legislation. It is put up before the people to see how much they want to spend. This bill will meet a need, and it is a compromise which the board will share.

DISCUSSION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 496: Rep. Switzer asked Chairman Darko if the county will vote separately from the city, or will they vote in one election? She replied that it will be in one election in the area that wants to form the district, which will probably be the city. Rep. Switzer then said he is not entirely clear on it, and Rep. Darko said the county and city will vote at the same time. Rep. Switzer then asked if it wouldn't be necessary to lay out the part of the county that would be included in the district before the election, and Rep. Darko answered yes, that it would be taken care of in Section 3, page 2 of the bill, and also Section 4. Rep. Switzer also asked if there are state statutes that define how to lay out the districts. Lee Heiman answered no there aren't any except it says it can be anywhere in the county. Rep. Darko said it is strictly by the areas that want to participate, and if they don't want to participate, they would not be included in the election. Rep. Switzer said he still hasn't figured out how the people will be allowed to vote, and Rep. Darko said that is explained on Page 3, line 1, which is the boundaries of the proposed

district, to which Rep. Switzer said that is the question -- how do you get the boundaries? Lee Heiman said that the people who pass the district have the say where the boundaries are. The county commissioners hold a hearing. Rep. Darko explained that it is not their intention to include anyone who does not want to be included.

Rep. Wallin addressed Rep. Darko that the bill says that 15% of the voters can create a district; therefore, how many does it take to say they don't want it? Rep. Darko answered that 15% have to come before the commission to say they want it, and a majority of those who participated in the election and voted can say they don't want it.

There being no further discussion, Rep. Darko closed the presentation.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 545: Rep. Cobb, sponsor of the bill, presented it to the committee. This is an act to allow a county treasurer to appoint an investment administrator.

PROPONENTS: Charles Graveley, appearing in behalf of the County Treasurers Association. He stated the purpose of this bill is to provide some additional compensation to the county treasurer for investing the county funds in such a manner that a greater return may be realized, which some may say is their duty now. The county commissioners have certain duties that are outlined for them. The last session has given them an extra $2,000, and the present session has given them an extra $200. Superintendents of schools have been provided an extra $2,000 if they have a master's degree. The county treasurers are very inadequately compensated for the duties that are placed on them, and the money would come from the investment account. Mr. Graveley then read a letter from Virginia W. Plouffe, Roosevelt County Treasurer which is attached as exhibit 1. He also said that school secretaries in Roosevelt county received $25,300 annual salaries and school custodians received $25,418, which they don't begrudge them. However, they do not have the responsibilities that are placed on the county treasurers. They feel the treasurers should be adequately compensated. This bill is not mandatory, and it requires the approval of county commissioners before the appointment can be made, before the $3,000 is given. In closing, he asked the committee to give a Do Pass.

Susan Spurgean, Fergus County Treasurer, stated that today's attention focuses on investing, and this takes quite a bit of time for the treasurers. A study of the cash flow should be done periodically. One point that can't be stressed enough is the investment program. Fergus County is fortunate they have a total investment program. They have some school districts that are investing on their own through their office.

seconded by Rep. Kitselman. Question being called for, motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 496: Rep. Brown moved to DO PASS, seconded by Rep. Kadas. Chairman Darko moved the amendments, and Rep. Brown seconded them. Lee Heiman explained the technical amendments. Question was called for and motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Rep. Brown then moved to DO PASS AS AMENDED, seconded by Rep. Kitselman. Question being called for, motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 545: Rep. Sales made the motion of DO NOT PASS, seconded by Rep. Kitselman. Rep. Kadas asked why he was trying to kill it. Rep. Sands asked Rep. Sales what is wrong with adding an amendment to make it discretionary with the commissioners. Rep. Sales answered that it is giving them the right to raise wages of one in the courthouse, but not the rest.

Rep. Brown moved to amend line 12, following compensation, to insert "as determined by the board of county commissioners" and on line 13, strike "is $3,000" and insert after administrator "shall be fixed at not less than $500 or no more than $3,000". Amendment died for lack of a second to the motion. Rep. Brandewie stated he thinks the committee should stick with HB 514 and give everyone raises.

Question being called for, Rep. Sales' motion CARRIED, with Rep. Brown voting no.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 654: Rep. Brown moved to DO PASS HB 654, and this was seconded by Rep. Kitselman. Rep. Kadas moved to amend line 25 by striking "sheriff" and inserting "general fund", and also include them in the title. This was seconded by Rep. Sales. Amendment CARRIED. Rep. Brown then moved to DO PASS AS AMENDED, seconded by Rep. Kadas.

Rep. Pistoria said this does not make any sense, and Rep. Switzer said he would have to vote against it.

Question was called for, and Rep. Brown's motion PASSED, with Rep. Pistoria and Rep. Switzer voting no.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 483: Rep. Brown moved a DO PASS, seconded by Rep. Kadas. Rep. Kitselman moved to amend and this was seconded by Rep. Kadas. Question being called for, amendment PASSED. Rep. Brown then moved to DO PASS AS AMENDED HB 483, and this was seconded by Rep. Gilbert. Motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 484: Rep. Kitselman moved that HB 484 DO PASS, seconded by Rep. Fritz. Rep. Sands moved to amend, and this was seconded by Rep. Kitselman. Rep.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 14, 1985

MR. SPEAKER:

We, your committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT

having had under consideration HOUSE Bill No. 496

FIRST reading copy (WHITE color)

AUTHORIZING FORMATION OF COUNTY PARK DISTRICTS.

Respectfully report as follows: That HOUSE Bill No. 496

BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. Page 7, line 20.
Strike: "9"
Insert: "10"

2. Page 8, line 19.
Strike: "10"
Insert: "11"

AND AS AMENDED,

~~DO~~ PASS

PAULA DARKO, Chairman.

STATE PUB. CO.
Helena, Mont.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

EXHIBIT 1
HB 496
2-14-85
Rep. Darko

WITNESS STATEMENT

Name DANIEL MILLER Committee On

Address R2, Box 73C, LIBBY, MT Date 2/14/85

Representing Support ✓

Bill No. 496 Oppose

Amend

AFTER TESTIFYING, PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

1.

2.

3.

4.

Itemize the main argument or points of your testimony. This will assist the committee secretary with her minutes.

FORM CS-34
1-83

Statement of Daniel A. Miller to the Local Government Committee

To Representative Paula Darko,Members of the Local Government Committee:

My name is Daniel Miller. I am the Personnel Manager at Champion International, Libby, Montana. I am appearing before you on behalf of the Libby Swimming Pool Task Force. We are a group of citizens established to research out the feasibility of a swimming pool for the Libby area. Our efforts have been endorsed by both the Libby City Council and the Lincoln County Commissioners. Our research has brought me to you today because it shows a larger problem than building and maintaining a swimming pool.

Before I get into the larger problem alittle history is in order: In the fall of 1981, a study group made up of local Libby community leaders distributed a survey throughout the Libby area. Its goal was to find out at the grass roots level exactly what the citizens of our community wanted for the future in the areas of cultural, educational, and recreational facilities and programs.

There were over 1,100 responses to that survey in an area populated with 12,000 citizens. The results showed that our community ranked a swimming pool facility as first priority. Second priority was a Junior College/vocational training program; third, a sports complex at the old Libby airport no longer used as an airport. Fourth, a summer recreation program for all ages; fifth, expansion of the Senior Citizens Center. And sixth, was a community auditorium.

With the help of Rep. Darko and the enabling legislation passed by the last legislature, our community now has its Junior College. Last fall we formally dedicated the Libby Center, an extension of Flathead Valley Community College. So the number two item on the community survey is now a reality.

The third item was the airport sports complex. There are four ball diamonds, a horse arena, and part of a jogging trail located on the old airport site. Most of the work was done by volunteer labor. Much work is left to do.

The fourth item, a summer recreation program.-- A program has been presented from year to year for our youth depending on available funding through the school district. There's no long term plan or program. It lacks organization and a steady income base.

The fifth item on the survey -- expansion of our Senior Citizens Center is done. The Senoir Citizens Center has a new addition on it which is being used constantly by that segment of our community. The first ranked item on that survey -- a swimming pool -- and sixth ranked item -- a community auditorium--are both a wish in the community's eye right now. The biggest question is how can they be financed? And second, who is going to run them once they are built? I joined the Libby Swimming Pool Task Force last summer to make the #1 community choice a reality. This group met with the Libby City Council, the School Board, and held three public meetings. As a result of the input from these meetings, the Task Force came to the realization there was no reasonable way in Lincoln County to finance and manage a pool or any other major recreation or parks facility. The larger problem is the Libby community's inability to satisfactorily fund and give solid direction to a comprehensive, long-term Park and Recreation program. The Libby City Council members have told our group they cannot afford to install parks facilities for Greater Libby use due to the small tax base. The County Commissioners in Lincoln County told our group they are sympathetic to what we are trying to do, but a county-wide funding of large parks and recreation facilities and projects is not possible. Citizens of Troy(18 miles away) and Eureka(60 miles away) should not have to fund facilities for Greater Libby's use.

Our Task Force had the Montana Code researched. We concluded from this research the only way under present law to establish and fund a parks and recreation program is either at full county level, or at city level, neither of which is possible with the present county population structure. Maybe we have a unique situation where members of our community are concentrated around Libby but not exclusively <u>in</u> Libby. Because of this, neither the county nor the city is willing to establish and fund a Parks and Recreation program to the extent indicated by the 1981 Libby survey.

So here we are asking you to consider legislation through House Bill 496. This bill, if passed, will allow the citizens in the Greater Libby area to determine if and how they want to better their community through a Parks District. We need this legislation so the leaders of our community can offer to the Greater Libby electorate a means to obtain those high priority items on the community's survey

list, a swimming pool, a well thought out and funded sports complex and development of other park lands and programs.
This can best be offered through a Parks District as outlined in House Bill 496.

Exhibit
HB 496
2-14-85
Rep. Da

WITNESS STATEMENT

Name Mitzi Smart Committee On Local Gov's

Address Rt. 2 Box 547A Libby, Mt. 59923 Date 2-14-85

Representing _____ Support ✓

Bill No. 496 Oppose _____

Amend _____

AFTER TESTIFYING, PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

1.

2.

3.

4.

Itemize the main argument or points of your testimony. This will assist the committee secretary with her minutes.

FORM CS-34
1-83

Last summer some interested people in Libby got together to investigate the possibility of getting a swimming pool for our town. We went to the City Council and they said they couldn't afford a pool as they were too small and didn't have enough taxpayers to support a pool. Next we went to the County Commissioners and they said they couldn't spend county money to build a pool in one town that the rest of the towns couldn't use. Now we would like to divide the county into a district that would be bigger than the city, but not as big as the entire county. The towns in Lincoln county are far apart and really can't share this kind of a facility. I feel that we need legislation to allow the people to establish park and recreation districts within counties. These districts would be able to levy taxes to support projects like swimming pools, ball fields, and picnic areas that would add to the environment and the quality of life.

Thank You,

Mitzi Smart
Rt. 2 Box 547A
Libby, Montana 59923

LIBBY AREA

POPULATION AND TAX STATISTICS

Libby Population (No. of Registered Voters)	2,748
Libby School District #4 (No. of Registered Voters)	7,600
Greater Libby Area-No. of People	12,000
Tax Notices Sent in Libby	1,221
in Lincoln County	15,000
School District #4 - 1 Mill Yields	$33,310

Current Total Assessment -

Libby in Town	290.8 Mills
Libby Out (Fire)	233.14 Mills

Example:

$60,000 Home in Libby - 1 Mill Levy = $5.13

Lincoln County now assess .54 mills for parks.

Statement of Daniel A. Miller to the Local Government Committee
To Representative Paula Darko,Members of the Local Government Committee:

My name is Daniel Miller. I am the Personnel Manager at Champion International, Libby, Montana. I am appearing before you on behalf of the Libby Swimming Pool Task Force. We are a group of citizens established to research out the feasibility of a swimming pool for the Libby area. Our efforts have been endorsed by both the Libby City Council and the Lincoln County Commissioners. Our research has brought me to you today because it shows a larger problem than building and maintaining a swimming pool.

Before I get into the larger problem alittle history is in order: In the fall of 1981, a study group made up of local Libby community leaders distributed a survey throughout the Libby area. Its goal was to find out at the grass roots level exactly what the citizens of our community wanted for the future in the areas of cultural, educational, and recreational facilities and programs.

There were over 1,100 responses to that survey in an area populated with 12,000 citizens. The results showed that our community ranked a swimming pool facility as first priority. Second priority was a Junior College/vocational training program; third, a sports complex at the old Libby airport no longer used as an airport. Fourth, a summer recreation program for all ages; fifth, expansion of the Senior Citizens Center. And sixth, was a community auditorium.

With the help of Rep. Darko and the enabling legislation passed by the last legislature, our community now has its Junior College. Last fall we formally dedicated the Libby Center, an extension of Flathead Valley Community College. So the number two item on the community survey is now a reality.

The third item was the airport sports complex. There are four ball diamonds, a horse arena, and part of a jogging trail located on the old airport site. Most of the work was done by volunteer labor. Much work is left to do.

The fourth item, a summer recreation program.-- A program has been presented from year to year for our youth depending on available funding through the school district. There's no long term plan or program. It lacks organization and a steady income base.

The fifth item on the survey -- expansion of our Senior Citizens Center is done. The Senoir Citizens Center has a new addition on it which is being used constantly by that segment of our community. The first ranked item on that survey -- a swimming pool -- and sixth ranked item -- a community auditorium--are both a wish in the community's eye right now. The biggest question is how can they be financed? And second, who is going to run them once they are built? I joined the Libby Swimming Pool Task Force last summer to make the #1 community choice a reality. This group met with the Libby City Council, the School Board, and held three public meetings. As a result of the input from these meetings, the Task Force came to the realization there was no reasonable way in Lincoln County to finance and manage a pool or any other major recreation or parks facility. The larger problem is the Libby community's inability to satisfactorily fund and give solid direction to a comprehensive, long-term Park and Recreation program. The Libby City Council members have told our group they cannot afford to install parks facilities for Greater Libby use due to the small tax base. The County Commissioners in Lincoln County told our group they are sympathetic to what we are trying to do, but a county-wide funding of large parks and recreation facilities and projects is not possible. Citizens of Troy(18 miles away) and Eureka(60 miles away) should not have to fund facilities for Greater Libby's use.

Our Task Force had the Montana Code researched. We concluded from this research the only way under present law to establish and fund a parks and recreation program is either at full county level, or at city level, neither of which is possible with the present county population structure. Maybe we have a unique situation where members of our community are concentrated around Libby but not exclusively <u>in</u> Libby. Because of this, neither the county nor the city is willing to establish and fund a Parks and Recreation program to the extent indicated by the 1981 Libby survey.

So here we are asking you to consider legislation through House Bill 496. This bill, if passed, will allow the citizens in the Greater Libby area to determine if and how they want to better their community through a Parks District. We need this legislation so the leaders of our community can offer to the Greater Libby electorate a means to obtain those high priority items on the community's survey

list, a swimming pool, a well thought out and funded sports complex and development of other park lands and programs.
This can best be offered through a Parks District as outlined in House Bill 496.

77

Board To Interview Architects For Swimming Pool Proposal

ether to build or not to
: a community swimming
under the direction of
ol District 4.
ere seems to be no clear
er to that question, and
ol trustees haven't made
heir collective minds if
are going to go ahead with
a project. But they
n't scrapped the idea,
r. They will interview
itects Sept. 13, beginning
p.m. They may select one
ork on the project shortly
eafter, in time to announce
the Sept. 15 Western News.
the architect would meet
the board and members of
public at the regular
ting of school trustees on
t. 19.
Up to that point, we won't
committed," one trustee
arked.
here seems to be general
eement from most quarters
t a community swimming
l for year round use is
ded. Main question is
ether it should be a school
ject or a project of Libby
creation Association. If the
ool district proposes it and
s voter approval this fall,
tching funds are available
from the U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Since there is no recreation district at this time, it appears that it would take at least a year before the recreation district could make a similar proposal.

There is some feeling, vocalized by Terry Schultz, director of the county planning and health department, that if the school district builds a pool then needs of the community will take a back seat to school needs. School officials don't anticipate a great conflict between school and community needs.

Although a recent vote on the matter at a meeting of the Libby Recreation Association board of directors ended in a 3-3 tie, all segments of the recreation association have said they will support the project if the school district goes ahead with the plan.

Trustee Larry Sverdrup, who is also a member of LRA board, is a main booster of the pool project. He said, "Formation of a recreation district is of prime importance, and that will be going on simultaneously with the pool project. Formation of the recreation district takes signatures on a petition, and funding of the pool project takes a school election."

Near the end of the discussion, Trustee Karl Erhard said, "I think it behooves us to meet with the architects so I move to do so."

The five trustees at the special board meeting Monday approved the motion without opposition. Attending were Erhard, Sverdrup, Marlene Herreid, Chuck Woods and Earl Messick. Absent were Bob Oliverio and Lenore Goyen.

The school board had attempted to sample public opinion on the issue through two surveys, but the results weren't overwhelming, although they show a majority of persons in favor of the pool project by the school district.

"In summary, it appears that those citizens within School District 4 that responded to our random surveys would support the construction of an indoor pool for school and community use given the tentative and incomplete information available to date," reported Harley Paulson. "We should also keep in mind that this survey data represents a small fraction of the total Libby population."

Only 159 persons responded to the ballot printed in The Western News two weeks ago. There were 91 of the ballots marked in favor of the project and 68 ballots marked against the project. Broken into percentages, that meant 57 percent in favor and 43 percent against.

A little more than 200 persons were contacted by school secretaries in a telephone survey. Of them, 150, or 73 percent, gave an affirmative response, 45, or 22 percent, said no, and 9 were undecided.

Combining the two surveys, there were 343 persons who responded and 241, or 69 percent, said yes, they would favor School District 4 building a community swimming pool.

Architects who have contacted the board about the swimming pool project are Taylor, Thon and Associates of Kalispell; Bierrum Associates of Kalispell, and Eric Hefty and Associates of Missoula.

COMMUNITY SURVEY RANKINGS

Yes	No	
798	298	Swimming Pool
699	361	Junior College/ Vocational Education
695	355	Sports Complex at Airport
658	368	Summer Recreation for All Ages
640	371	Senior Citizen Center Enlargement
603	439	Auditorium
533	417	Ice Skating Rink
524	462	Downtown Ballpark Refurbishing
509	448	School Volunteer Program Expansion

Priority No. 1 & 2

1.	Swimming Pool	553
2.	Senior Citizen Center	277
3.	Airport Sports Complex	266
	Junior College/VoEd	266
4.	Auditorium	264
5.	Ice Skating Rink	76
6.	Summer Recreation	69
7.	Downtown Ballpark	57
8.	School Volunteer Prog.	23

Priority No. 1 - 5

1.	Swimming Pool	610
2.	Junior College/VoEd	482
3.	Airport Sports Complex	453
4.	Auditorium	422
5.	Senior Citizen Center	410
6.	Summer Recreation	316
7.	Ice Skating Rink	300
8.	Downtown Ballpark	194
9.	School Volunteer Prog.	122

	(All Three)	(Two of Three)	(One of Three)
TOP FIVE	Swimming Pool Junior College/VoEd Airport Sports Complex Senior Citizen Center	Auditorium	Summer Recreation
TOP THREE	Swimming Pool Junior College/VoEd Sports Complex	--------	Senior Citizen Center
TOP TWO	Swimming Pool	Junior College	Senior Citizen Center

February 5, 1985

Representative Paula Darko
House of Representatives
Capitol Station
Helena, MT 59620

COPY

Dear Paula,

I have discussed the creation of the County Parks District with Board Chairman Lenore Goyen as well as an avid supporter of the plan, Dan Miller.

Personally speaking, I would like to endorse the concept of the creation of the Parks District that would allow a group of concerned citizens to ban together and to form a taxation district for the welfare of the community. As a typical school administrator, I always have a little twinge of concern whenever I recommend such a position as it does lend, to a certain degree, competition to the school districts when they seek additional levy increases. I do, however, believe that that may be a purely selfish motive wherein, if we look at the whole picture, we must realize that for the betterment of any community, that community must be allowed an option to improve itself whether it be by recreation districts or by park districts.

House Bill 496, as you well know, does not mandate the creation of any district, nor force taxpayers into a taxing situation unless they so approve it. I strongly oppose the argument that further taxing districts should not be allowed to be created in order to save the taxpayer from any additional burden. In our republican form of government, as well as in any democratic society, one of the basic principles is that the majority must be allowed to determine needs of the whole. By restricting the majority by keeping from them an instrument that would allow themselves to better their community, I feel goes against our basic principles.

I strongly urge you to continue your support of House Bill 496.

An example would be the creation of the Flathead Valley Community College branch that we now have in Libby. Without this taxing authority, the community of Libby would not have had this very vital educational institution we now enjoy. The taxpayers saw fit to levy upon themselves a tax to support this institution, and now I feel that the taxpayer should also at least be given the opportunity to determine whether there is a need as great for a swimming pool. The only way to do this is by allowing them to create a district and levy a tax upon themselves.

I do regret I will not be able to attend the hearing as I have previously scheduled district board and committee meetings. Thank you for your time and cooperation!

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. PRATT,
Superintendent

RJP:jh

cc. Lenore Boyen
Dan Miller ✓

P.S. This is not an endorsed position by the Board of Trustees, but a personal opinion that I am giving you as a school superintendent.

COPY

PLUMMER COMMUNITY SCHOOL

ROUTE 3, BOX 997
LIBBY, MONTANA 59923
293-6204 EXT. 220

January 15, 1985

Representative Paula Darko
House of Representatives
State Capital
Helena, Montana 59620

Dear Paula:

The Plummer Community School Council is a group of parents and interested adults that meets monthly with school officials to help establish programs which enrich our children's school experience, contribute to community use and understanding of school facilities, and integrate community events and assets with the educational process. To be effective, the council must have a true sense of community and be aware of events, issues, needs and skills present in the area. It is on this basis that we wish to strongly support your efforts for legislation which will allow formation of recreation districts for purposes of more equitably funding needed community projects. As you are aware, the need for a swimming pool in Libby has been well established on the basis of both formal and informal opinion gathering. Because of the population distribution and density in Lincoln County, no single town or group can afford a swimming facility. Organization of a recreation district for purposes of financing a swimming pool appears to be a very workable solution to our problem and an obvious and immediate benefit of such legislation.

If we can provide any assistance to you in your efforts regarding park district legislation, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Tracy Scussel, Chairman
PLUMMER COMMUNITY SCHOOL COUNCIL

JoAnne Purdy
Joyce Brant, Co-Coordinators
PLUMMER COMMUNITY SCHOOL

KOOTENAI COMPOSITE SQUADRON
CIVIL AIR PATROL
Auxilary of the United States Air Force
BOX 216
LIBBY, MONTANA 59923

REPLY TO ATTN. OF:

4 February 1985

SUBJECT: County Parks & Recreation District Legislation

TO: Representative Paula Darko

We would like to make known our support of this legislation to you and the Local Government Committee. We feel that it would not be granting authority to anyone besides the voters, and that there would be no cost to Montana's General Fund. It would allow individual counties to establish districts so that important recreational improvements for the local involved populations can take place.

Libby, for instance, is currently trying to build a pool for all the county residents to use. The only way it will become a reality is for this legislation to pass. Civil Air Patrol's interest in a pool is tangible. We would be using it for Water Safety Training for our Cadet members (13-21y/o), and for recreational purposes by having an occassional "swim night" for all of our members.

We feel that the State Legislature should allow the counties the right to petition the voters, via a Parks and Recreation District, for funding various projects that will add to the quality of life for all its residents.

Therefore, on behalf of our membership, I urge you and the Local Government Committee to approve this important legislation, and refer it to the main floor with your highest recommendation for passage.

Thanks to you, Paula, and to the Committee for their consideration.

My Best Regards,

James R. Sheffield, CPT, CAP

February 4, 1985

Representative Paula Darko
Local Government Committee
Montana House of Representatives
Captial Station
Helena, Montana 59620

Dear Paula:

I am in favor of a bill to allow formation of a Recreation District within the Montana counties. The Libby Swimming Pool Task Force is presently working diligently to build a swimming pool for the City of Libby, and this is one course that can be taken if we had a Recreation District.

Sincerely,

Libby, Montana 59923

City	Pop.	# Pool	age	Indoor	Cultur.	Heated	Type of Pool	Total Revenue	Total Excess	Pool Exp.	No. of Staff	No. of Staff	Total Payroll	Maint. & Exp.	% to Pool Budget	Pool Profit	Pool Deficit	Covers Deficit			
Cut Bank	3,000	1	23		X	X	gas	$21,641.	—	[illegible]	—	22	$4464.	$19,404	60%	—	—	City			
Chinook	5,000	1	—		X	X	gas	$16,916.	$180.	[illegible]	—	15	$28,205.	$16,730	32%	—	$39,115.	City			
Columbus	5,000	3	2 - 17 yrs 1 - 3 yrs		X		?	$22,544	$3,325	Rec Dir.	—	48	$70,000.	$41,000	?	—	$45,131.	City			
Ft. Benton	1,900	1	8		X	X	gas	$16,882.	—	Rec Dir.	6	—	$10,233	$13,300	60%	—	$6,550	Gen Fund			
Lake Mary Ronan	4,000	1	4	X		X	gas	—	—	[illegible]	1	4	$42,570	$24,961	—	—	—	School			
Lewistown	5,000	2	1 large 5 yrs 1 small 5 yrs	X		X	hot H_2O	$45,000	—	Rec	1 rec 13 small 6	large 6 small 7	$55,000	$25-30,000	$18-20,000		$5-10,000	City			
Savage		1			X	X	oil	$5963.	—	[illegible]	4	—	$5071.	$4,700	75%		$12,712	Tax			
Hamilton	2695	1	25		X	X	gas/elec.	—	—	[illegible]	5	1	$14,617.	$5,064	62%	—	$7,237.	City			
Hardin	2304	1			X	X	gas	$11,206	—	[illegible]	—	6	$11,445.	$21,476.	90%	—	$10,270.	City	Teen Fund		
Culbertson	620	2	8		X	X	elect.	$7,645	—	Rec Dir.	1	12	$15,885.	$5,600	50%	—	—	private/	Mont. Power Co.	Grants	
Stevensville	1220	1	3/4 built 6 improvements		X	X	gas	$6100.	—	Manager	4	3	—	$9564	50%	—	$2436.	City taxes			
Plains	1200	1	8		X	?	propane	$6516.	—	Rec Dir.	0	6	—	$16,899	20%	—	$10,382	City			
Havre	10000	1 Public College	8½	X		X	gas	$38,553	—	Rec Dir.	—	10		$34,696	60%	—	$25,603	City			
Roundup	3500+	1 Public 2½ acre	—		X	X	?	—	—	[illegible]	—	11	$16,951.	$9,014	—	—	—	City			
Kalispell, Wa.	11,500	1 Public Recreation Center	5yrs.	X	X	X	electric	$40,555	$7630	Rec Dir.	2	10-15	$13,109.	$64,583	48%	$1900					
Sunburst	1365	1	20+		X	X	Propane	$7200	—	Rec Dir.	5	2	$2,000	$8,100	1-33%	—	$2,800	City			
Miles City	10,000	1 Swim Hole	50yrs.		X			$16,727	—	Mayor	2	14	$9,706	$24,010	—	—	$2100	City			
Columbia Falls	$31,000	1	50+ improvements		X	X	gas	$5498	—	City	7	—	$40,665	$21,443 improvements	—	—	$26,000	City - mill levy			

Lincoln County Parks & Recreation Department

418 Mineral Avenue
Libby, Montana 59923
(406) 293-7781

Statement in Support of House Bill 496

The Lincoln County Parks and Recreation Board support House Bill 496 introduced by Representative Paula Darko. The reasons are as follows:

- House Bill 496 will allow for the creation of separate Recreation Districts within the large Montana counties.
- The creation of Recreation Districts within a county will allow for proper support for recreational projects which could feasibly be used by residents of a small portion of the county.
- The creation of Recreation Districts will allow for better planning, supervision and support of recreational projects for those residents residing within the district. Each district could tailor the directions of their recreation program to suit it's own needs.
- Most counties within Montana are very large with the population of the counties primarily located in towns separated by many miles. The creation of the Recreation District will allow each geographic area to design it's recreation program without placing a burden upon the tax payers throughout the county who would in reality not be able to use or benefit from the program.
- House Bill 496 provides for the creation of the Recreation District through the majority vote of the residents residing within the proposed Recreation District. Each voter will have the opportunity to decide for or against the creation of the Recreation District. Once created the voters will have the opportunity to vote for or against mill levy requests to support the recreation projects within the district. The Recreation District will help to prevent the outlying residents and the residents of the small towns of the county from paying for programs they cannot use nor be rightly called upon to support.

House Bill 496 is a sound step in the direction of supplying Montana's counties with the tools to provide sound and well conceived recreational programs for their residents.

Exhibit 3
HB 496
2-14-85
Rep. Darko

Lincoln County Parks & Recreation Department

418 Mineral Avenue
Libby, Montana 59923
(406) 293-7781

Statement in Support of House Bill 496

The Lincoln County Parks and Recreation Board support House Bill 496 introduced by Representative Paula Darko. The reasons are as follows:

- House Bill 496 will allow for the creation of separate Recreation Districts within the large Montana counties.
- The creation of Recreation Districts within a county will allow for proper support for recreational projects which could feasibly be used by residents of a small portion of the county.
- The creation of Recreation Districts will allow for better planning, supervision and support of recreational projects for those residents residing within the district. Each district could tailor the directions of their recreation program to suit it's own needs.
- Most counties within Montana are very large with the population of the counties primarily located in towns separated by many miles. The creation of the Recreation District will allow each geographic area to design it's recreation program without placing a burden upon the tax payers throughout the county who would in reality not be able to use or benefit from the program.
- House Bill 496 provides for the creation of the Recreation District through the majority vote of the residents residing within the proposed Recreation District. Each voter will have the opportunity to decide for or against the creation of the Recreation District. Once created the voters will have the opportunity to vote for or against mill levy requests to support the recreation projects within the district. The Recreation District will help to prevent the outlying residents and the residents of the small towns of the county from paying for programs they cannot use nor be rightly called upon to support.

House Bill 496 is a sound step in the direction of supplying Montana's counties with the tools to provide sound and well conceived recreational programs for their residents.

Exhibit 4
HB 496
2-14-85
Rep. Darko

WITNESS STATEMENT

NAME Joan Poston BILL NO. 496

ADDRESS 1415 Sibelius Helena DATE 2/14/85

WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT? Lewis & Clark County Park Board

SUPPORT X OPPOSE _____ AMEND _____

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

This is not just a problem in Lincoln County. There are similar situations and a similar demographic make-up in Lewis & Clark County.

Exhibit 5
HB 496
2-14-85
Rep. Darko

LIBBY COMMUNITY EDUCATION
111 EAST LINCOLN BLVD.
LIBBY, MONTANA 59923
(406) 293-6622

February 12, 1985

Rep. Paula Darko
Local Government Committee
Montana House of Representatives
Capitol Station
Helena, MT 59620

Dear Ms. Darko:

The purpose of this letter is to request your support of HB 496, Formation of County Park District.

The need for youth services, which includes recreation, is well documented in the South Lincoln County area. Following a detailed needs assessment in 1979, a Youth Activities Program was established in the community under the sponsorship of an Aid Association to Lutherans grant. This program has been maintained with funding through School District #4.

In order to serve these youth year around, we need to be able to establish a recreation district and program summer activities. Last year only 103 youth could be served due to funding and personnel limitations as opposed to 2,725 youth served during the school year in school facilities in the Youth Activities Program.

Your support of HB 496 would allow the people of Lincoln County to choose to provide recreational services for youth and adults. Such programs have served a need in the past and, in my opinion, would be supported by the people if a vehicle for organization and funding could be established.

Sincerely,

Harley Paulson
Community Education Director

HP:ck

Exhibit 6
HB 496
2-14-85
Rep. Darko

LIBBY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
111 EAST LINCOLN BLVD.
LIBBY, MONTANA 59923

406-293-6204

February 12, 1985

Representative Paula Darko
Local Government Committee
Montana House of Representatives
Capitol Station
Helena, MT 59620

Dear Paula,

As the hearings are beginning concerning House Bill 496, we feel that the Board of Trustees for the Libby School District needs to make their position clear in the matter.

As you may recall, Libby School District has been involved off and on concerning the building of a swimming pool. At one time the district even sponsored a levy for that purpose and for a variety of reasons, that levy was defeated. At this time with our dwindling finances and declining enrollment, we cannot take a position which would endorse the school sponsoring a swimming pool or even operating and managing it. We do, however, want to go on record that we would be interested should a pool be built, of our willingness to provide swimming programs that would be of benefit for our students.

We ask that you do not take our position as one of non-support of House Bill 496 and what it would allow the community to do; but as one of not wishing to own and operate a pool due to funding complications. As individual members, we may each take our own position, but in order to clarify the matter, we are speaking as the Board of Trustees for the Libby School District on this issue.

Thank you for your time and consideration and do not hesitate to contact us should you wish any additional information.

Sincerely,

Lenore Goyen

Lenore Goyen Chairman
Board of Trustees
Libby School District No. 4

LG:jh

VISITORS' REGISTER

Local Government COMMITTEE

BILL NO. HB 496 DATE Feb. 14, 1985

SPONSOR Rep. Darko

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
STEPHEN PRAY	645 OTHORP RD, RENFORD, MT	✓	
Mitzi Smart	Rt. 2 Box 547A Libby	✓	
DAN MILLER	R2, Box 73C, LIBBY	✓	
Bayard Q. Stone	P.O Box 536 Libby	✓	
Irene Parmenter	Park Apt #2, Libby	✓	
G. Morris	MRCO	✓	
Dave Conklin	Bringsley Wilderness Helena	✓	
Gretchen Olheiser	Mt. Recreation & Park Assn 1616 Cannon #23 Helena	✓	
Mary Noonan	Mineral	✓	
Ed Dawson	Mineral	✓	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FOR

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE SENATE

March 26, 1985

The twenty-seventh meeting of the Local Government Committee was called to order at 12:30 p.m. on March 26, 1985 by Chairman Dave Fuller in Room 405 of the Capitol Building.

ROLL CALL: All members were present.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 496: Representative Paula Darko, District #2, is the sponsor of this bill. The bill was introduced to authorize the creation of county park districts for the operation of county or donated park and recreation lands within the district; to provide for the creation, after an election, of such a district; to provide for an elected commission to administer the district; to provide for a property tax mill levy for the operation of the district; to provide that the maximum district mill levy must be approved by the district electorate; to provide for the administration of such a district; to provide bonding authority for such a district; and to provide for the alteration and dissolution of such a district.

PROPONENTS

Mitzi Smart, a Libby resident, spoke in favor of the bill. She submitted a booklet containing information on the bill and written testimony. It is attached as Exhibit A to these minutes.

Robert Ryan, member of the Lewis and Clark County Park Board, spoke in favor of the bill. He said SB 204, which is similar to this bill, is not in conflict with HB 496. He said they are two different means of financing county parks. Larger counties would probably use SB 204 and rural areas would probably use HB 496.

Dave Conklin, member of the Lewis and Clark County Park Board, spoke in favor of the bill. He said they need all the options they can get for funding of county parks.

Gretchen Olheiser, President of the Montana County Parks Association, stated her support of the bill.

OPPONENTS

There were no opponents to HB 496.

Chairman Fuller opened the hearing for Committee questions. There were no questions from the Committee regarding HB 496.

The hearing was closed on HB 496.

Senator Story asked if "area" meant the lot space or the building space. Mr. Lawton said it is the lot space.

The hearing was closed on HB 612.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 736: Representative Earl Lory, District #59, is the sponsor of this bill. The bill was introduced to authorize the governing body of a municipality or a county to require financial security from an owner of twenty-five percent or more of the lots within an improvement district for reimbursement of a revolving fund.

PROPONENTS

There were no proponents to HB 736.

OPPONENTS

There were no opponents to HB 736.

Chairman Fuller opened the hearing for Committee questions.

Senator Crippen suggested striking the word "may" and inserting "will." He also expressed concern with requiring a fifteen year irrevocable letter of credit. Bill Verwolf said the letter of credit would not necessarily be for fifteen years. The bill requires a letter of credit acceptable to the local government. This could be for as little as four or five years.

Senator Eck asked if this bill would do away with SIDs. Mr. Lawton said there have been some defects in the SID laws that are causing the problems they now have, although he doesn't feel SIDs should be done away with entirely. This bill would make developers take a much harder look at what is being financed by SIDs.

Senators Mohar and Crippen expressed concern about a person who posts this security and then wants to sell part or all of the land. Mr. Lawton said they would be refunded in proportion to the sale.

The hearing was closed on HB 736.

ACTION TAKEN ON HOUSE BILL 496: Senator Eck moved that HB 496 BE CONCURRED IN. The motion passed unanimously. Senator Mohar will carry the bill.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 885: Representative Walter Sales, District #76, is the sponsor of this bill. The bill was introduced at the request of the Lieutenant Governor. The purpose of the bill is to amend and clarify the laws relating to rural special improvement districts and special improvement districts; and to amend provisions relating to incidental costs, protests, assessment options, acquisition of improvements, notice, definitions of bonds, redemption of bonds, revolving funds, and refunding bonds.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

MARCH 26 19 85

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT

having had under consideration HOUSE BILL No. 496

THIRD reading copy (BLUE color)

(MOHAR WILL CARRY)

AUTHORIZING FORMATION OF COUNTY PARK DISTRICTS

Respectfully report as follows: That HOUSE BILL No. 496

BE CONCURRED IN

XXXXXX DO PASS

~~XXXXXXXXX DO NOT PASS~~

Senator Dave Fuller Chairman.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
MARCH 26, 1985
EXHIBIT A

TESTIMONY FOR HOUSE BILL 496

LIBBY AREA

POPULATION AND TAX STATISTICS

Libby Population (No. of Registered Voters)	2,748
Libby School District #4 (No. of Registered Voters)	7,600
Greater Libby Area-No. of People	12,000
Tax Notices Sent in Libby	1,221
in Lincoln County	15,000
School District #4 - 1 Mill Yields	$33,310

Current Total Assessment -

Libby in Town	290.8 Mills
Libby Out (Fire)	233.14 Mills

Example:

$60,000 Home in Libby - 1 Mill Levy = $5.13

Lincoln County now assess .54 mills for parks.

Last summer some interested people in Libby got together to investigate the possibility of getting a swimming pool for our town. We went to the City Council and they said they couldn't afford a pool as they were too small and didn't have enough taxpayers to support a pool. Next we went to the County Commissioners and they said they couldn't spend county money to build a pool in one town that the rest of the towns couldn't use. Now we would like to divide the county into a district that would be bigger than the city, but not as big as the entire county. The towns in Lincoln county are far apart and really can't share this kind of a facility. I feel that we need legislation to allow the people to establish park and recreation districts within counties. These districts would be able to levy taxes to support projects like swimming pools, ball fields, and picnic areas that would add to the environment and the quality of life.

Thank You,

Mitzi Smart
Rt. 2 Box 547A
Libby, Montana 59923

The Western News 311 California Avenue Libby, Montana 59923 406-293-4124

February 13, 1985

To whom it may concern:

The Western News supports House Bill 496, which, if passed, would make it possible for the people of Libby and vicinity to establish a parks and recreation tax district.

This, in turn, would make it possible for residents to seriously consider financing and constructing a swimming pool.

The need is great. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

H. Markley McMahon
Publisher

Statement of Daniel A. Miller to the Local Government Committee
To Representative Paula Darko,Members of the Local Government Committee:

My name is Daniel Miller. I am the Personnel Manager at Champion International, Libby, Montana. I am appearing before you on behalf of the Libby Swimming Pool Task Force. We are a group of citizens established to research out the feasibility of a swimming pool for the Libby area. Our efforts have been endorsed by both the Libby City Council and the Lincoln County Commissioners. Our research has brought me to you today because it shows a larger problem than building and maintaining a swimming pool.

Before I get into the larger problem alittle history is in order: In the fall of 1981, a study group made up of local Libby community leaders distributed a survey throughout the Libby area. Its goal was to find out at the grass roots level exactly what the citizens of our community wanted for the future in the areas of cultural, educational, and recreational facilities and programs.

There were over 1,100 responses to that survey in an area populated with 12,000 citizens. The results showed that our community ranked a swimming pool facility as first priority. Second priority was a Junior College/vocational training program; third, a sports complex at the old Libby airport no longer used as an airport. Fourth, a summer recreation program for all ages; fifth, expansion of the Senior Citizens Center. And sixth, was a community auditorium.

With the help of Rep. Darko and the enabling legislation passed by the last legislature, our community now has its Junior College. Last fall we formally dedicated the Libby Center, an extension of Flathead Valley Community College. So the number two item on the community survey is now a reality.

The third item was the airport sports complex. There are four ball diamonds, a horse arena, and part of a jogging trail located on the old airport site. Most of the work was done by volunteer labor. Much work is left to do.

The fourth item, a summer recreation program.-- A program has been presented from year to year for our youth depending on available funding through the school district. There's no long term plan or program. It lacks organization and a steady income base.

The fifth item on the survey -- expansion of our Senior Citizens Center is done. The Senoir Citizens Center has a new addition on it which is being used constantly by that segment of our community. The first ranked item on that survey -- a swimming pool -- and sixth ranked item -- a community auditorium--are both a wish in the community's eye right now. The biggest question is how can they be financed? And second, who is going to run them once they are built? I joined the Libby Swimming Pool Task Force last summer to make the #1 community choice a reality. This group met with the Libby City Council, the School Board, and held three public meetings. As a result of the input from these meetings, the Task Force came to the realization there was no reasonable way in Lincoln County to finance and manage a pool or any other major recreation or parks facility. The larger problem is the Libby community's inability to satisfactorily fund and give solid direction to a comprehensive, long-term Park and Recreation program. The Libby City Council members have told our group they cannot afford to install parks facilities for Greater Libby use due to the small tax base. The County Commissioners in Lincoln County told our group they are sympathetic to what we are trying to do, but a county-wide funding of large parks and recreation facilities and projects is not possible. Citizens of Troy(18 miles away) and Eureka(60 miles away) should not have to fund facilities for Greater Libby's use.

Our Task Force had the Montana Code researched. We concluded from this research the only way under present law to establish and fund a parks and recreation program is either at full county level, or at city level, neither of which is possible with the present county population structure. Maybe we have a unique situation where members of our community are concentrated around Libby but not exclusively <u>in</u> Libby. Because of this, neither the county nor the city is willing to establish and fund a Parks and Recreation program to the extent indicated by the 1981 Libby survey.

So here we are asking you to consider legislation through House Bill 496. This bill, if passed, will allow the citizens in the Greater Libby area to determine if and how they want to better their community through a Parks District. We need this legislation so the leaders of our community can offer to the Greater Libby electorate a means to obtain those high priority items on the community's survey

Board To Interview Architects For Swimming Pool Proposal

Whether to build or not to build: a community swimming pool under the direction of School District 4.

There seems to be no clear answer to that question, and school trustees haven't made up their collective minds if they are going to go ahead with such a project. But they haven't scrapped the idea, either. They will interview architects Sept. 13, beginning at 7 p.m. They may select one to work on the project shortly thereafter, in time to announce it in the Sept. 15 Western News. Then the architect would meet with the board and members of the public at the regular meeting of school trustees on Sept. 19.

"Up to that point, we won't be committed," one trustee remarked.

There seems to be general agreement from most quarters that a community swimming pool for year round use is needed. Main question is whether it should be a school project or a project of Libby Recreation Association. If the school district proposes it and gets voter approval this fall, matching funds are available from the U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Since there is no recreation district at this time, it appears that it would take at least a year before the recreation district could make a similar proposal.

There is some feeling, vocalized by Terry Schultz, director of the county planning and health department, that if the school district builds a pool then needs of the community will take a back seat to school needs. School officials don't anticipate a great conflict between school and community needs.

Although a recent vote on the matter at a meeting of the Libby Recreation Association board of directors ended in a 3-3 tie, all segments of the recreation association have said they will support the project if the school district goes ahead with the plan.

Trustee Larry Sverdrup, who is also a member of LRA board, is a main booster of the pool project. He said, "Formation of a recreation district is of prime importance, and that will be going on simultaneously with the pool project. Formation of the recreation district takes signatures on a petition, and funding of the pool project takes a school election."

Near the end of the discussion, Trustee Karl Erhard said, "I think it behooves us to meet with the architects so I move to do so."

The five trustees at the special board meeting Monday approved the motion without opposition. Attending were Erhard, Sverdrup, Marlene Herreid, Chuck Woods and Earl Messick. Absent were Bob Oliverio and Lenore Goyen.

The school board had attempted to sample public opinion on the issue through two surveys, but the results weren't overwhelming, although they show a majority of persons in favor of the pool project by the school district.

"In summary, it appears that those citizens within School District 4 that responded to our random surveys would support the construction of an indoor pool for school and community use given the tentative and incomplete information available to date," reported Harley Paulson. "We should also keep in mind that this survey data represents a small fraction of the total Libby population."

Only 159 persons responded to the ballot printed in The Western News two weeks ago. There were 91 of the ballots marked in favor of the project and 68 ballots marked against the project. Broken into percentages, that meant 57 percent in favor and 43 percent against.

A little more than 200 persons were contacted by school secretaries in a telephone survey. Of them, 154, or 73 percent, gave an affirmative response, 45, or 22 percent, said no, and 9 were undecided.

Combining the two surveys, there were 245 persons who responded and 177, or 72 percent, said yes, they would favor School District 4 building a community swimming pool.

Architects who have contacted the board about the swimming pool project are Taylor, Thon and Associates of Kalispell; Bierrum Associates of Kalispell, and Eric Hetty and Associates of Missoula.

COMMUNITY SURVEY RANKINGS

October 1981
1100 + Replys

Yes	No	
798	298	Swimming Pool
699	361	Junior College/ Vocational Education
695	355	Sports Complex at Airport
658	368	Summer Recreation for All Ages
640	371	Senior Citizen Center Enlargement
603	439	Auditorium
533	417	Ice Skating Rink
524	462	Downtown Ballpark Refurbishing
509	448	School Volunteer Program Expansion

Priority No. 1 & 2

1.	Swimming Pool	553
2.	Senior Citizen Center	277
3.	Airport Sports Complex	266
	Junior College/VoEd	266
4.	Auditorium	264
5.	Ice Skating Rink	76
6.	Summer Recreation	69
7.	Downtown Ballpark	57
8.	School Volunteer Prog.	23

Priority No. 1 - 5

1.	Swimming Pool	610
2.	Junior College/VoEd	482
3.	Airport Sports Complex	453
4.	Auditorium	422
5.	Senior Citizen Center	410
6.	Summer Recreation	316
7.	Ice Skating Rink	300
8.	Downtown Ballpark	194
9.	School Volunteer Prog.	122

	(All Three)	(Two of Three)	(One of Three)
TOP FIVE	Swimming Pool Junior College/VoEd Airport Sports Complex Senior Citizen Center	Auditorium	Summer Recreation
TOP THREE	Swimming Pool Junior College/VoEd Sports Complex	----------	Senior Citizen Center
TOP TWO	Swimming Pool	Junior College	Senior Citizen Center

February 5, 1985

Representative Paula Darko
House of Representatives
Capitol Station
Helena, MT 59620

Dear Paula,

I have discussed the creation of the County Parks District with Board Chairman Lenore Goyen as well as an avid supporter of the plan, Dan Miller.

Personally speaking, I would like to endorse the concept of the creation of the Parks District that would allow a group of concerned citizens to ban together and to form a taxation district for the welfare of the community. As a typical school administrator, I always have a little twinge of concern whenever I recommend such a position as it does lend, to a certain degree, competition to the school districts when they seek additional levy increases. I do, however, believe that that may be a purely selfish motive wherein, if we look at the whole picture, we must realize that for the betterment of any community, that community must be allowed an option to improve itself whether it be by recreation districts or by park districts.

House Bill 496, as you well know, does not mandate the creation of any district, nor force taxpayers into a taxing situation unless they so approve it. I strongly oppose the argument that further taxing districts should not be allowed to be created in order to save the taxpayer from any additional burden. In our republican form of government, as well as in any democratic society, one of the basic principles is that the majority must be allowed to determine needs of the whole. By restricting the majority by keeping from them an instrument that would allow themselves to better their community, I feel goes against our basic principles.

I strongly urge you to continue your support of House Bill 496.

An example would be the creation of the Flathead Valley Community College branch that we now have in Libby. Without this taxing authority, the community of Libby would not have had this very vital educational institution we now enjoy. The taxpayers saw fit to levy upon themselves a tax to support this institution, and now I feel that the taxpayer should also at least be given the opportunity to determine whether there is a need as great for a swimming pool. The only way to do this is by allowing them to create a district and levy a tax upon themselves.

COPY

I do regret I will not be able to attend the hearing as I have previously scheduled district board and committee meetings. Thank you for your time and cooperation!

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. PRATT,
Superintendent

RJP:jh

cc. Lenore Goyen
Dan Miller ✓

P.S. This is not an endorsed position by the Board of Trustees, but a personal opinion that I am giving you as a school superintendent.

COPY

PLUMMER COMMUNITY SCHOOL

ROUTE 3, BOX 997
LIBBY, MONTANA 59923
293-6204 EXT. 220

January 15, 1985

Representative Paula Darko
House of Representatives
State Capital
Helena, Montana 59620

Dear Paula:

The Plummer Community School Council is a group of parents and interested adults that meets monthly with school officials to help establish programs which enrich our children's school experience, contribute to community use and understanding of school facilities, and integrate community events and assets with the educational process. To be effective, the council must have a true sense of community and be aware of events, issues, needs and skills present in the area. It is on this basis that we wish to strongly support your efforts for legislation which will allow formation of recreation districts for purposes of more equitably funding needed community projects. As you are aware, the need for a swimming pool in Libby has been well established on the basis of both formal and informal opinion gathering. Because of the population distribution and density in Lincoln County, no single town or group can afford a swimming facility. Organization of a recreation district for purposes of financing a swimming pool appears to be a very workable solution to our problem and an obvious and immediate benefit of such legislation.

If we can provide any assistance to you in your efforts regarding park district legislation, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Tracy Scussel, Chairman
PLUMMER COMMUNITY SCHOOL COUNCIL

JoAnne Purdy
Joyce Brant, Co-Coordinators
PLUMMER COMMUNITY SCHOOL

KOOTENAI COMPOSITE SQUADRON
CIVIL AIR PATROL
Auxilary of the United States Air Force
BOX 216
LIBBY. MONTANA 59923

REPLY TO ATTN. OF:

4 February 1985

SUBJECT: County Parks & Recreation District Legislation

TO: Representative Paula Darko

We would like to make known our support of this legislation to you and the Local Government Committee. We feel that it would not be granting authority to anyone besides the voters, and that there would be no cost to Montana's General Fund. It would allow individual counties to establish districts so that important recreational improvements for the local involved populations can take place.

Libby, for instance, is currently trying to build a pool for all the county residents to use. The only way it will become a reality is for this legislation to pass. Civil Air Patrol's interest in a pool is tangible. We would be using it for Water Safety Training for our Cadet members (13-21y/o), and for recreational purposes by having an occassional "swim night" for all of our members.

We feel that the State Legislature should allow the counties the right to petition the voters, via a Parks and Recreation District, for funding various projects that will add to the quality of life for all its residents.

Therefore, on behalf of our membership, I urge you and the Local Government Committee to approve this important legislation, and refer it to the main floor with your highest recommendation for passage.

Thanks to you, Paula, and to the Committee for their consideration.

My Best Regards,

James R. Sheffield, CPT, CAP

February 4, 1985

Representative Paula Darko
Local Government Committee
Montana House of Representatives
Captial Station
Helena, Montana 59620

Dear Paula:

I am in favor of a bill to allow formation of a Recreation District within the Montana counties. The Libby Swimming Pool Task Force is presently working diligently to build a swimming pool for the City of Libby, and this is one course that can be taken if we had a Recreation District.

Sincerely,

Libby, Montana 59923

City	Dep.	# Pool	age	Indoor	Outdoor	Heated	Type of Pool	Total Revenue	Total Expenses	Pool Exp.	No. of Staff	No. of Staff	Total Payroll	Maint'ed Expense	% to Rec'ed	'84 Profit	'84 deficit	Covers Deficit
Lake Dive	10,000	1	23		X	X	gas	$21,641.	—	Parks Dept	—	22	$44,641.	$19,424.	60%	—	—	City-Lake Dive
Helena	25,000	1	—		X	X	gas	$16,916.	$180.	[illegible]	—	15	$22,215.	$16,783.	87%	—	$39,115.	City
Billings	85,000	3	2 - 17yrs 1 - 2yrs		X		?	$62,544	$3,325.	Rec Div	—	48	$70,000.	$41,000.	?	—	$45,131.	City
Ft. Benton	1800	1	8		X	X	gas	$6,982.	—	Rec Div	6	—	$12,233.	$3,100.	60%	—	$6,500.	Gen Fund
Deer Lodge	4,500	1	4	X		X	gas	—	—	Supervisor	1	4	$40,500.	$4961.	—	—	—	School
Missoula	55,000	2	large 5yrs small 15yrs	X		X	hot H2O	$45,000.	—	Rec	large 13 small 6	large 6 small 7	$55,000.	$25-30,000	18-20,000		$35-40,000	City
Superior		1			X	X	oil	$5963.	—	City Clerk	4	—	$5071.	$4900.	75%		$12,712.	Tax
Hamilton	2675	1	25		X	X	gas/elec.	—	—	Ad Asst	5	1	$14,617.	$5,064.	60%	—	$7,237.	City
Hardin	2364	1			X	X	gas	$11,206.	—	City Clerk	—	6	$11,445.	$21,476.	90%	—	$10,270.	City Gen Fund
Colstrip	6260	2	8		X	X	elect.	$7,645.	—	Rec Div	1	12	$15,885.	$5,600.	50%	—	—	Private/Mint. Power Co./Teen's
Stevensville	1220	1	24 built 6 improvements		X	X	gas	$6160.	—	Mayor	4	3	—	$9564.	50%	—	$2436.	City taxes
Havre	10,000	1 Public 1 College	8½	X		X	gas	$8,553.	—	Rec Div	—	10		$34,696.	60%	—	$25,603.	City
Kalispell	3500+	1 Public 1 Private	—		X	X	—	—	—	Comm Facilities	—	11	$16,951.	$9,014.	—	—	—	City
Ronan, Wa.	11,500	indoor	5yrs.	X	X	X	electric	$40,555	$7630.	Rec Div	2	10-15	$13,109	$64,583	45%	$1900.		
Scobey	1365	1	20+		X	X	propane	$7220	—	Rec Div	5	2	$12,000	$2,600	+-30%	—	$2,800	City
Miles City	10,000	1 swim lake	50yrs		X			$11,727	—	Mayor	0	14	$9,226	$4,000	—	—	$3000	City
Columbia Falls	$31,000	1	50+ improvements		X	X	gas	$5,498.	—	City	7	—	$10,665	$21,443 improvements	—	—	$26,000	City-mill levy

DATE 3-26-85

COMMITTEE ON Local Gov't

VISITORS' REGISTER

NAME	REPRESENTING	BILL #	Check One: Support	Check One: Oppose
Robert L. Ryan	L & C County Parks	HB 496	✓	
Mike Smart	Libby Swimming Pool Task Force	HB 496	✓	
Linda Scott (Libby)	Swimming Pool Task Force	HB 496	✓	
Dennis M. Smith	Montana Rural Water Sys. Inc.	HB 894	✓	
Bruce Kerford	County Water Dist of Bigs Heights	HB 894	✓	
John Lawton	City of Billings	HB 612 HB 885	✓ ✓	
Earl Lory	Rd #5-9 Missoula	HB 736	✓	
Mortimer Oliveira	Mt Recreation & Parks Assn	HB 496	✓	
Dave Griffin	L & C County Park Board	HB 496	✓	
D Morris	MMCO	614	✓	
D Morris	"	885	✓	
Greg Jackson	Urban Coalition	(HB) 612	✓	
Bill Verwolf	City of Helena	885 612	✓ ✓	